

NWP
971.5
062
C.3

e. l.

C. B.

21

2.2

OPPOSITION SLANDERS REFUTED.

THE POOLEY SCANDAL.

THE BAKER SCANDAL

INTESTATE ESTATES. SUITORS' FUNDS.

MINOR SLANDERS.

WHO ARE THE SCANDAL-MONGERS?

SPEECH OF THE PREMIER ON THE BUDGET.

CARRYING THE WAR INTO EGYPT.

COMPARISON OF TRAVELLING EXPENSES UNDER OPPOSITION REGIME
AND NOW.

\$3,500 FOR ONE TRIP TO ENGLAND AND NOT AN ITEM OF DETAIL.

\$1,100 FOR ONE TRIP TO OTTAWA.

WHAT GOVERNMENT USED THE INTESTATE ESTATES FUNDS
WITHOUT AUTHORITY?

ROBBING THE DEAD!

POLITICAL ANARCHISM.

THE BUDGET.

HON. MR. DAVIE resumed the debate on the budget. In the words of Artemus Ward, with reference to the song literature following the American war, he considered it about time to give "the old man a show," and the house having heard so much from the Opposition about Government misdoings, it would be in order to hear something on the other side. In the first place he would examine into some of the charges which had been made, and compare the conduct of the Government to the Leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman had made the rather startling statement that the Province would

lose upwards of \$600,000 in the conversion of \$1,700,000 of 6 per cent. and $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. bonds into 3 per cents., or that more than one-third of the amount would be wasted in the operation. So far as observable, however, neither the House nor the country had been alarmed by this or any other wild statement of blue ruin made in that hon. gentleman's speech, for they had become so well accustomed to the cry of "wolf! wolf!" from him that they now paid little or no attention to it. His efforts had come to be correctly appreciated, and it is known that he has the knack of so presenting half the truth that it leaves a falsehood. He would deal

with these objects later on; but first of all, it would be well to "whet the palate," as it were, with

"A PLATE OF OYSTERS."

before entering upon the substantial repast, and to refer to some of the scandals, as the Leader of the Opposition called them, viz., the Pooley scandal, the Baker scandal, and others of which the gentlemen opposite are by their own description the scandal mongers. He could not pretend to say that he would deal with all the insinuations, but he would take up as many as time would permit. There was for instance the question of

"TRAVELLING EXPENSES."

In treating of the subject the Leader of the Opposition had omitted to make reference to those incurred by the Government of which he was a member, much less, had he brought the figures down before the House. In disclosing them now he (Mr. Davie) did not wish to raise any question of dishonesty or impropriety against anyone, for a Minister of the Crown must be treated as an honourable man and not required to give particulars for every cent that he spends while attending to the public business, and when Mr. Beaven was in office he appeared to have acted on the proper principle that a Minister of the Crown while travelling should maintain the dignity of his office. The records, then, showed that on the 13th of June, 1874, it was decided to be necessary that

"THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL IN MR. BEAVEN'S GOVERNMENT"

should go to England, and on the 15th of June he gave a receipt for \$2,500 and drew out that amount for his travelling expenses as an officer on duty, giving no particulars. Later on he drew on the treasury for \$500, and when he came back he drew, supplementary to the two sums just mentioned, \$510.99, making a total of \$3,510.99, DRAWN SIMPLY FOR TRAVELLING EXPENSES WITHOUT ANY PARTICULARS WHATEVER.

The Opposition at that time had not called for the vouchers or attempted to make a scandal out of a matter in which there probably was no scandal, though the amount of it was three times that now called in question, and the present Leader of the Opposition, who now holds up his hands in such holy horror, had then not one word of complaint, showing that it is only the most transparent political hypocrisy which leads him to question the smaller sum after sanctioning the larger. (Applause.) The gentlemen opposite paraded in large type in their organ in this city his own (MR. DAVIE'S) TRAVELLING EXPENSES, AMOUNTING TO \$1,900, SINCE HE TOOK THE OFFICE OF PREMIER IN JULY, 1892.

While he disliked to have to refer to his own personal services he thought as a mat-

ter of simple justice he ought to say a few words as to the return made for this money, but he would refer only to some of the more important tasks upon which he had been engaged when these expenses were incurred. These were the long and difficult prosecution at Nanaimo in connection with the Bawnmore case; the Teragnello murder trial at the same place on another occasion, long and complicated cases engaging weeks, and which no reputable counsel could have been engaged to conduct under at least \$1,500; the trials in Cariboo, in Clinton and at Kamloops; the Stroebel trial, lasting twelve days at Westminster and upwards of two weeks at Victoria, for which counsel worthy of having such cases entrusted to them, could not have been engaged under \$3,000 or more, besides other important business in which HE COULD, IF SO DISPOSED, HAVE ENTRUSTED THE PROSECUTION TO OUTSIDE COUNSEL, THE COST TO THE PROVINCE BEING \$5,000 OR MORE, BUT FOR WHICH HE (MR. DAVIE) HAD DRAWN \$1,900 ONLY, FOR NECESSARY TRAVELLING EXPENSES, TO SAY NOTHING OF TWO TRIPS ACROSS THE CONTINENT ON IMPORTANT PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Apart, however, from the question of cost, he had felt that he should undertake these prosecutions, as any miscarriage of justice would have been in the highest degree disastrous to the Province; and he felt it incumbent upon him to sacrifice his own convenience in the effort to maintain law and order and secure confidence in the administration of justice in the Province. The plan adopted in bringing these so-called scandals before the House appeared to be to spring them at a time when those against whom they are levelled are by the rules of debate prevented from replying immediately—on the principle that a lie will travel a mile while truth is putting on its boots, and they make sure that their lies will get a long start. He would deal now with what has been called

"THE POOLEY SCANDAL,"

the subject matter of which is that Mr. Pooley, who holds the honorary office of President of the Council, without salary, and is at the same time a practising barrister, with a large and important practice, had gone into Court in a case in which one of his clients, the E. & N. railway, have a dispute with the Government. He would like before proceeding further in the matter to lay down the broad principle, that it is the privilege of any man who happens to be a barrister, when called to Her Majesty's council, to retain his private practice, for otherwise no lawyer whose services were worth having could enter the Government. A little reflection would show the soundness of this principle, for if it were not to be acted upon what would be the position of a barrister who had given up his practice to

become Attorney-General, if in a short time he found that it did not suit him to remain in that position, or if the public decided for him—at the polls or otherwise—that a change in the office was desirable? It would be monstrous to expect that while exposed to this contingency he should abandon his private means of livelihood. It might happen that the private interests of a member of the Government would come in conflict with those of the Crown, and in such a case these private rights must be respected. Even the Attorney-General might be in duty bound to appear for a private client against the Crown. This, of course, is a privilege which should be given only to an honourable man, and should not be abused. The New South Wales case cited by Mr. Cotton was not a parallel one to that in which Mr. Pooley had appeared to argue a dry point of law involving no secrets of the Government, and in which nothing he could have learned in the executive could be of any advantage to him; but on the contrary that case establishes the right in the clearest way, but there it was considered that the privilege was abused, for the Attorney-General and the Minister of Justice, presumably the only two law offices of the Government, both took briefs against a department of the Government. The gentlemen opposite did not seem to recognize the difference between the use and abuse of such a privilege. The case of the President of the Council was quite different. He could not have appeared for the Crown, unless his services were to be accepted for nothing, for the moment he accepted a retainer he would forfeit his seat, so the contention of the Opposition must be that he must forfeit his right of appearing in the case, one way or the other. Looking up the records for a precedent, since this matter was last before the House, the very first case he came across was one in England.

AN ENGLISH PRECEDENT.

The Attorney-General *vs.* the London & North-Western Railway Co. L. R. 6 Q. B. D.

HON. MR. BEAVEN—In England it is a different thing altogether.

HON. MR. DAVIE said this was not a different thing, but he would later show a case nearer home. In this English suit in the court of first instance there was no official of the Government on either side. The question was one as to duties payable to the Crown, the point in dispute being whether duty should be paid on sleeping car tickets the same as on ordinary tickets. The exchequer division gave judgment for the Crown, and the defendant having appealed the Solicitor-General, Sir Farrar Herschell, appeared in the appeal Court against the Crown.

"SIR FARRAR HERSCHELL."

Though in England the Solicitor-General and Attorney-General are not members of the Cabinet they are law officers of the Crown, and it is their duty to advise whether or not proceedings should be brought. If there were danger for abuse of authority how could it be more abused than by a Solicitor-General appearing against his own client, the Government, as had been done in the suit just mentioned. He had noticed a case also where the Solicitor-General appeared for the Crown and the Attorney-General for the other side. The Leader of the Opposition might, however, have given an instance which happened nearer home in this Province, while that hon. gentleman had a seat in the House, but to which he took no exception, perhaps because he was not then associated with the senior member for Vancouver and the member for Westminster City. This was the case in which the present

"MR. JUSTICE MCCREIGHT,"

An adornment to the bench of the Province—when Attorney-General and Premier of the Province, appeared as Counsel for Dr. Trimble in his suit against the Crown for five acres of land at Ogden Point.

HON. MR. BEAVEN—Everybody knows that.

HON. MR. DAVIE asked how it came that if everybody know this there was nothing to be said against it while it was made to appear a grave offence in the President of the Council to appear for a regular client, when he draws no salary as a member of the Government and could not appear for the Crown? These precedents showed conclusively that in Mr. Pooley's case no rule of propriety had been transgressed.

"BAKER SCANDAL."

To turn next to the so-called Baker scandal, it was surprising that the gentleman opposite could see nothing to condemn in their own course of appropriating private documents not intended for them, but waiving that point it would be seen on examination how little foundation there is for the slander put in circulation. It was decided by the Lieut.-Governor in Council that the Province should be represented at the opening of the Imperial Institute, a determination which, as it had not met with a motion of condemnation in the House, it must be assumed meets with general approval. The Government, therefore, chose as the most fitting representative the Provincial Secretary, a gentleman well known in England, of a family known all over the world, who could worthily represent the Province, and having been dispatched on this mission his expenses were of course paid out of the Public Treasury. It was absurd to contend that while in England he should not have given any attention to his private business, just as it

would be to say that Mr. Pooley should abandon his law practice, or that Mr. Turner should retire from the position which he holds as a merchant. What had occurred appeared to be that he placed himself in the hands of his solicitors there, and in making the statement of what he had to sell appended his name and official titles in full. If he had left out his offices, this very fact would have covered the whole affair with suspicion, for business men would ask why this James Baker appeared to be anxious to conceal his identity—why if the business he was engaged in was a straightforward one he should not disclose his official titles. He had already shown that the practice of ministers of the Crown in England and in Canada and elsewhere is to give their titles in full on such occasions. The names of SIR JOSEPH TRUTCH, a former Lieut.-Governor; SIR CHARLES EUAN SMITH, and the EARL of DENBIGH, were a guarantee of what is right and honourable. Their names would not be sullied with what is wrong.

The so-called "PERVERSION OF TRUST MONIES" was made a matter of arraignment of the Government by Mr. Beaven, who quoted the funds in connection with the Shuswap and Okanagan and the Nakusp and the Slocan Railways, the intestate estates and the suitors' funds, and arrived at the conclusion that "those kind of people who call this a surplus of revenue but he could not think that the members of the Legislature could be made to believe it." Now the fallacy of this reasoning, or what would be fallacy if there were any sincerity in it, which there is not, is that it treats the Government as if it were a Municipality—bound to keep each expenditure under its own head. Under the Statutes governing these cases the Government is constituted the banker of the funds, and required to deal with them accordingly. It has to make interest on them and so of course must use them; and it was therefore impossible that they be kept as separate accounts and withdrawals paid from time to time out of these identical moneys. Until 1890 these suitors' funds used to remain in the Government's hands without interest. Then was passed the "Suitors' Fund Act," requiring payment of everything into the treasury, and section 9 provides that the moneys shall bear interest, which they cannot do unless the Government uses them. It is a case of paying in and out every day, so the idea of a special deposit, which would involve money being kept three months at least if to draw interest, is out of the question. Mr. Beaven's contention, if there was any sincerity in it at all, would involve him in this that the money is to bear no interest. Though at one time, before the "Suitors' Fund Act," or "Intestate Estates Act," had been passed, when the Government had no right to use this money, yet Mr. Beaven did

use it, and at the election of 1875 it was a cry against him—merely an election cry, he was bound to say—that he had "not only plundered the living but robbed the dead."

HON. MR. BEAVEN—One of your cries, I suppose.

HON. MR. DAVIE continued that at that time he was not of an age to be much mixed with politics, but he had already told the House that he believed the charge was not a just one. The point, however, is that Mr. Beaven is now complaining because the Government has done by legislative authority what he did by no authority at all. So it is in the matter of the railway funds, which it is intended shall be used by the Government to give it whatever advantage is thus derivable and to avoid to this extent the necessity of making loans. Mr. Beaven had next told the House that he expects that the

"I. O. U.'s OF MINISTERS"

are to be found in the treasury, when he knows that in the exercise of the privilege accorded him he has been ransacking everything there, and would have been the first to discover any irregularities had they existed, and to have reported them. This insinuation is somewhat akin to the slime of his organ, which insinuates that there are other moneys besides salaries and their travelling allowances which ministers have received, but which are covered up somewhere. He knows there can be none, that the accounts are on open book there. While the slime and insinuations cast on those who are alive carry their own condemnation, and, like a boomerang, rebound upon the man who would heap up such transparent slander, there are other slanders which call for more severe condemnation. Mr. Beaven told the House that on one occasion when he assumed office as Finance Minister, he found in the treasury safe "I. O. U.'s from the ministers of the Crown down to the messengers." The only occasion to which he could have referred was when he (Mr. Beaven) took office in 1878. He would like to ask if there was any I. O. U. there from Mr. Vernon, who was a member of the Government to which Mr. Beaven succeeded in 1878, and is now a member of this Government.

HON. MR. BEAVEN took his head.

HON. MR. DAVIE continued that the other members were Messrs. Elliott, Smithe, and Ebenezer Brown, all of whom had been dead for years, but in their lifetime such an accusation had never been made against them.

HON. MR. BEAVEN—It has been discussed here over and over again.

HON. MR. DAVIE said he had been in the House since 1862, but had never before heard a hint of such a thing. He wondered that the hon. gentleman was not afraid now that the dead would rise from their graves

to denounce him a perjurer. Even if these men had chanced to draw small sums against their salaries, and had deposited their I.O.U.'s in acknowledgment, that fact would have been no justification for the insinuation of dishonesty made against them after their death. It was a foul slander, and why did he not bring it against these men when alive? Twenty years ago it had been used against him, Mr. Beaven, as an electioneering cry, that he had "robbed the dead"—but now, in the year of grace 1894, he has really "ROBBED THE DEAD," or tried to—robbed them of all that remains of their treasured memory, a fair fame and worthy reputation, and this from the "Leader of the Opposition"; a charge he had never dared to make in their lifetime, and which he, Mr. Davie, would now tell him he believed to be deliberately false. (Loud applause.)

Dr. Davie's appointment as "PROVINCIAL HEALTH OFFICER" had been lately used for political effect, because of the circumstance of his being a relative of the Premier. It had, however, been indisputably shown that that gentleman's skilful and vigorous services saved the country from a scourge with which the leader of the opposition had shown himself "UTTERLY UNABLE TO COPE," in his position as Mayor of Victoria. It was when this had become apparent that on the 9th of July, 1892, the medical men at their meeting endorsed the proposal that a provincial health officer should be appointed. Even the opposition organ in Victoria lauded the appointment, and as to its wisdom, and the effective manner in which the duties were carried out, the report of Chief Justice Sir Matthew Begbie and the other members of the health commission was satisfactory proof, far ahead of the jaundiced, prejudiced and envious view taken by the Leader of the Opposition now that the danger is all over. Within three months, when the scourge was over, the Provincial Health Officer, who was appointed for a temporary service only, resigned, being paid for his services \$1,000, which no one would say was not of the best earned money ever paid to a public servant. (Applause.) Afterwards, a convention of medical men was called at Ottawa to consider the best steps to be taken to prevent disease entering the country, and in his (the Premier's) absence his colleagues came to the conclusion that the Province should be represented, and that the man to send there was Dr. Davie, who had so successfully fought the smallpox and had acquired valuable experience. He accordingly went, leaving his private practice for the discharge of a public duty, and for the time necessarily occupied received \$1,000, which no one would say was too much to pay to a physician of standing for such a mission, besides \$300 travelling expenses. Following on this visit to Ottawa, though no doubt the representations made by Dr. Milne when there and the correspondence between the

two governments had also something to do with it, it was decided that the new quarantine station should be established at William Head. He did not think that anyone would seriously question the account for this trip, but he might compare it with a voucher, No. 5375, put in for a trip of one of Mr. Beaven's ministers who was at Ottawa from December, 1879, to March, 1880, and put in his "VOUCHER No. 5375, WITHOUT AN ITEM OF DETAIL, FOR \$1,102, AS 'TRAVELLING EXPENSES TO OTTAWA AND MONTREAL AND RETURN.'" Some time after Dr. Davie's trip to Ottawa, when the smallpox seemed likely to break out again, he was once more appointed temporarily Provincial Health Officer, and when not only this country but the continent of America seemed threatened with a still more deadly scourge, Asiatic cholera, his (Mr. Davie's) colleagues thought it proper to see that the best preventative measures were taken, and hence Dr. Davie's re-appointment from October, 1892 to December, 1893, when, the danger being past, the health officer again ceased to hold office, at Dr. Davie's own suggestion. He thought no one would say that his appointment was not in the best interests of the country, and that the payment made was not insignificant in comparison with the good done.

"CONVERSION OF LOANS."

Amongst other things which the Minister of Finance showed in his clear and lucid handling of the finances was that by reason of the conversion to three per cents, some £85,000 or £90,000 of the accumulated sinking fund would be released, about \$130,000 of which is now available. To this the Leader of the Opposition retorted that a letter from Sir Charles Tupper, which he had been shown in the treasury, stated the money could not be released. To show with what perfect frankness he was dealt with in the treasury, and how open everything was there to him, it might be stated that the letter which he was shown had only just been received from Sir Charles, and had not even been registered. Unfortunately, that letter had disappeared after it had been shown to the public accounts committee, but Sir Charles Tupper had been cabled for a copy, and in the meantime Mr. Beaven could have, if he wished, Sir Charles' answer by cable, which would show how much truth there was in the statement that Sir Charles had asserted the sinking fund could not be released.

HON. MR. BEAVEN—What you say is not what I said.

HON. MR. DAVIE replied that if Mr. Beaven was not correctly understood it is not necessary to refer further to the matter. If he merely contends that for the unconverted balance of the loan the sinking fund will have to be remitted there is nothing in the point, for everyone knows that. If the Government be successful in completing the conversion, the £90,000 comprising the

whole of the sinking fund will at compound interest for 50 years amount to an enormous sum, upwards of the £600,000.

"PURLOINING PUBLIC DOCUMENTS."

As an offset to the circumstance so clearly proved that his private documents had been perused in Cariboo and purloined at Chilliwack for the use of the Opposition, the charge had been made against him that he had been guilty of impropriety in taking the Public Accounts of 1893 to a meeting and too good-naturedly giving a copy to Mr. Kitchen. The House was told that he ought to be impeached and dismissed for this supposed offence against it. What he had done, however, was within the province of any Minister to do, and was the practice in other places. He noticed that the local organ of the opposition had attempted to bolster up Mr. Beaven's plea that the practice of the Dominion House of Commons could not be quoted here as a precedent because there was a special order of the House there, and the supposed order was published. An examination, however, showed that the circumstances under which this resolution was passed were the strongest justification possible for what he had done. He read the resolution, and quoted from the speech made by Mr. Charlton in moving it, in which that gentleman, so far from complaining because information from the blue book had been used in advance of its presentation to Parliament, stated that he was indebted to the great courtesy of the Minister of Finance for this information, in the absence of which he could not have arrived at the real state of the public debt. Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Blake spoke of the advantage of giving the matter to the public in advance of the meeting of parliament. Sir John Macdonald accepted the resolution, which came as a suggestion from the other side of the House, saying that he saw no objection to it, that there was nothing in the law to prevent the departmental reports being given to the public as soon as completed, and as it was only a practice which had grown up to keep them from general circulation until parliament met, he had the word "rule" used by Mr. Charlton in the resolution altered to "practice."

To recapitulate, the facts showed the Opposition to be

"WHITED SEPULCHRES."

They "STRAIN AT A GNAT," but "SWALLOW A CAMEL." THEY STRAIN at a little act of courtesy, such as the handling of a public document, although hitherto unpublished, to an opponent; THEY SWALLOW a camel in justifying an act of flagrant dishonesty, such as the appropriation of private documents, i. e. the Cranbrook prospectus, and his, Mr. Davie's, private documents at Cariboo and Chilliwack. THEY STRAIN at the moderate expense of \$1,000 for a Minister's trip to England, all detailed, but they

SWALLOW A CAMEL, in the shape of a bill for three times the amount for a similar service, without a detail at all. THEY MANUFACTURE A GNAT in the shape of what at most would have been a trifling advance, during the month to a public officer, on account of his salary, but THEY SWALLOW a camel by making the occasion the subject of a hideous attack upon the character of the dead. THEY STRAIN at a gnat in the using of the Intestate Fund under legislative authority, whilst THEY SWALLOW a camel by the using of that same fund without any authority at all, whether legislative or otherwise. Truly they were whited sepulchres.

He had thus far barely finished up the plate of oysters, and there was now barely time, nor he feared would the house have the patience, to enter upon the more substantial portion of the repast (Cries of go on), but—

To revert to the "CONVERSION OF THE LOANS," he wished to take up Mr. Beaven's statement that the Province loses \$600,000 by the conversion of \$1,724,000, or more than one-third of the amount. If the Province loses this, the convertees—to coin an expression—must gain it, but that there is no particular advantage to the convertees is shown by the fact that only one-third of the amount has yet been converted. The whole scheme is worked out by skilled actuaries, whose endeavour is to secure that neither side has an advantage. Those who accept the scheme simply wish to exchange a short time loan, at a high rate of interest, for a long time one at a lower rate, and take an equitable premium to make up the deficiency. Time would not now admit of his going into the figures, which could be more ably dealt with by the Hon. Minister of Finance, who doubtless would have another opportunity of speaking.

EXPENDITURES ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Though Mr. Kitchen staunchly supported Mr. Beaven, the latter had taken exception to the expenditure of \$6,000 on the roads in Westminster district, in addition to the \$12,000 voted; the amount expended was \$22,000; while Mr. Kitchen had during the recess, been going from north to south in his constituency complaining that the Government had not spent enough upon the roads. Westminster could see from this incident how much she could expect if the Opposition party were in power. Mr. Beaven's further contention, brought out in the public accounts committee report, that the Government should not anticipate the revenue in their expenditure on roads and bridges, shows how he would treat the country if in power. The excess over revenue in expenditure on roads and bridges, amounting to \$460,305.36, he would postpone for a year, because, forsooth, the revenue was not available for another six months! He thought he had conclusively

shown how hollow were the superior pretensions of the party opposite; that they are, as he had termed them, in fact, "whited sepulchres," and he held that they are likewise little better than

"POLITICAL ANARCHISTS."

Their aim is to destroy character, of the dead as well as of the living—to destroy provincial credit and the rights of property generally—the credit of the province as proved by their separation petition, and of their binding themselves with Mr. Duval, for whose utterances they try to free themselves. If they did not agree with Mr. Duval in his idea of stopping the floating of the debt they should at once have said so; but some one, imagining Duval voiced the sentiment of the meeting, did attempt to carry out Duval's project. "A Man is Known by the Company He Keeps," and similarly they cannot now disclaim, as they are trying to do, Mr. Duval's or Rev. Mr. Maxwell's effort to ruin public credit. Upon ordinary principles of criminal law each one of those banded together for the objects of the meeting were responsible for Mr. Duval's utterances, in light of the fact, especially as regards Mr. Brown, of his being present at the meeting of the 18th April at Vancouver, in thorough accord with the objects of the meeting, and offering no word of objection to what Mr. Duval said. Mr. Cotton actually served on a committee appointed at that meeting to carry out its objects, and Mr. Duval was his co-committee man. (Mr. Davie read from the News-Advertiser of the 19th April.) He, (Mr. Davie) in illustration of the principle that a man is judged by his company, would remind hon. gentlemen opposite of the fable of "THE ASS AND HIS PURCHASER." A man wanted to purchase an ass, and agreed with its owner to try him before he bought him. He took the ass home and put him in the straw yard with his other asses, upon which the ass, the subject of purchase, left all the others, and joined himself to the most idle, and the greatest eater of them all. Whereupon the intending purchaser put a halter on him, and led him back to his owner, who asked, how he could have made a trial in so short a time. "I do not need," he answered, "a trial. I know he will be just such another as the one of all the rest he chose for his companion."

"So it is," remarked Mr. Davie, "with those who associated themselves with Mr. Duval and Mr. Maxwell." (Loud laughter.) He (Mr. Davie) charged the Opposition with inciting to anarchy when they try to incite the "LABOURING MAN TO REBEL AGAINST THE MEANS OF HIS DAILY BREAD" by telling him the capitalist is his enemy, and to make war on him and to show him his money is not safe when invested here. Directly a man brings money into the place and invests it, whether in land, or a street railway, or what not, they would make him "A TARGET

TO BE SHOT AT," and hold him up to the scorn of the workmen. An instance of this had lately occurred in this city, where the workmen had been lectured on the disadvantage of private ownership of the tramway and lighting apparatus, and it had been advocated that the property thus created by private capital should be made unprofitable by the construction of a rival scheme at public expense. If the public said, "We want to own such properties, and will put you out of the field by taking over your property at what it cost you," even this might seem hard to the men who had risked their capital in the hope of making a reasonable profit, but those who talked as the Opposition did made no suggestion of purchase. They wanted the property for nothing, or to freeze the rightful owner out of it. What encouragement to a man to invest his money here!

He had heard his hon. friend the Minister of Finance say that possibly or probably this would be his last budget speech, and that observation had been eagerly seized on by the Opposition press. No doubt that gentleman does sometimes feel discouraged to think that the vast services which he has rendered the province and the watchful care over its finances are met with reproaches and wilful misconception; that instead of appreciation, not to say thanks, he is accused of little else than being a pickpocket. But he must know that it is but a small and self-interested faction of the community who act thus. He must know that there is a watchful and appreciative public who are ever grateful and know how to reward a good and honest servant. He must, however, remember that it is to them he owes a duty and not to throw off that duty because there are a few ingrates in society. There are these everywhere, and it is only by reflection of the good against the bad that justice is seen in its true light. They have all a duty to perform here to society and must be unselfish. There is not a member of the Government, probably, who would not hail with delight the freedom from this kind of thing and the return to his own accustomed avocations and home, more profitable and more pleasurable to him than to be engaged in such wrangling as occurs here. But the issue is too serious at present. Other members on the Government side have not the time nor the inclination to give up their pursuits for official life, but by-and-by there will be those who are both able and willing to enter public life. Then will be the time when the present ministry may justly retire; but, in the meantime there is a hand-to-hand struggle going on between anarchism on the one hand, and progress and order on the other. They felt bound to see the struggle out to the bitter end. With him it was "war to the knife" against such a faction, and he had no doubt whatever that intelligence, honesty and good government will reign supreme.